

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

Miranda Lee Lufsky,

No. 24-cv-2530 (KMM/DTS)

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

Patrick Flanagan, et al.,

Defendant.

Plaintiff Miranda Lee Lufsky filed this action on June 28, 2024, and filed an amended complaint on August 6, 2024. The named Defendants are several Washington County officials, including several Washington County District Court judges; a Washington County prosecutor, social worker, and guardian ad litem; Washington County public defenders; the Washington County Sheriff; and several officers of the Forest Lake Police Department. Ms. Lufsky's claims arise out of Washington County child-welfare proceedings involving her two children. *In re Welfare of the Children of: Miranda L. Lufsky*, Court File No. 82-JV-23-482 (Washington Cnty. Dist. Ct.).

On September 5, 2024, the Court issued an Order, ECF 47, setting a briefing schedule on several motions to dismiss filed by groups of the defendants, *see* Motions at ECF 22, 30, 36. In that Order, the Court also denied Ms. Lufsky's motion for summary judgment as prematurely filed. Briefing on the motions to dismiss has been completed and the matters are under advisement.

On October 29, 2024, Ms. Lufsky filed two motions: (1) a motion for summary judgment, ECF 67; and (2) a one-page motion for “emergency injunction,” ECF 68. Since filing these motions, Ms. Lufsky has called the Court to request an expedited hearing on the motion for injunctive relief, and at the instruction of the Court’s staff, contacted the Court by email to make the request for an expedited hearing in writing. Ms. Lufsky has sent the Court no fewer than fifteen identical emails with the subject line “Expedited hearing for Emergency Injunction.”

The Court has reviewed Ms. Lufsky’s pending motions for summary judgment and for an emergency injunction as well as her requests for an expedited hearing. *See* ECF 76. Both motions, ECF 67, 68, and the request for a hearing, ECF 76, are denied. The renewed motion for summary judgment is still premature. No defendant has served or filed an answer and the Court has before it now several motions to dismiss, which the Court must address first. The motion for emergency injunction is not accompanied by any supporting memorandum of law or evidentiary submissions that would form a basis for the Court to grant preliminary injunctive relief to Ms. Lufsky. Ms. Lufsky’s requests for an expedited hearing are also denied. The Court is deciding the pending motions to dismiss on the papers, and no hearing is necessary at this stage.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: November 22, 2024

s/Katherine Menendez

Katherine Menendez
United States District Judge